

Draft
BDAC MEETING SUMMARY - ATTACHMENT A
NOVEMBER 4 & 5, 1997

BREAK -OUT SESSION SUMMARIES

The following summaries reflect different levels of detail. These differences do not indicate the quality of discussion, rather they reflect the detail provided on the newsprint.

YELLOW BREAK-OUT GROUP

Paul Schwarz - Facilitator
Martha Turner - Recorder
Rick Woodard - Resource Person

BDAC members present - Don Bransford, Martha Davis, Steve Hall, Richard Izmirian, Rosemary Kamei, Stuart Pyle

Overview

During the break-out session, members convened, then expressed general comments about CALFED and about the task before them in the break-out session. They proceeded to provide comments on five of the eight example trade-offs, provided some additional general comments and concluded by receiving comments from members of the general public.

General Comments

Nearly all participants commented it was difficult to provide comments on the trade-offs as the discussion was occurring in the abstract.

Participants agreed there was inadequate time for discussion, both during the break-out session and in the overall CALFED timeline.

Participants noted that the format worked well given the time constraint. One participant suggested that a half or all-day small group session with a similar format as the break-out session would be beneficial. Several others agreed.

Policy Trade-Offs

Participants opened discussion on **Diversion Effects on Fisheries Vs. Assurances** with general comments about assurances. These were:

- Assurances are needed to determine the correct degree of protection for each interest represented by the CALFED alternatives
- Baseline assurances are necessary. These will cut across all alternatives.
- Some assurances will be legal, some will be political, and others are necessary for the physical

facilities; the latter may vary with each alternative.

Participants suggested several questions that need to be answered regarding this trade-off as a draft Preferred Alternative takes shape. These were:

- How much water supply reliability can be assured? The willingness-to-pay for measures to improve and rehabilitate the ecosystem will vary with the amount of water supply that can be assured.
- How will flows for fisheries purposes be guaranteed?
- How will assumptions be tested?
- In what ways can assurances be crafted to ensure that science will be used appropriately in decision-making?
- Are 15,000 cfs screens technically feasible? Given the expense of \$60 million for a new screen for a 3,000 cfs point of diversion in the Sacramento River system it may be prudent to use multiple diversion points.

Additionally it was noted that flows for fisheries purposes will need to be adaptively managed and that real-time monitoring at points of diversions as well as for other parts of the system is necessary.

The group continued discussion by focussing on **Water Supply Opportunities Vs. Total Cost**. The Program was encouraged to ensure that all program components (water use efficiency, water quality, ecosystem restoration, system integrity, and storage and conveyance) and resultant benefits use the same time scale before determining outcomes of this trade-off. For example, physical facilities are often constructed with a lifecycle of 50 years. Therefore, the other components should be considered over a similar time period.

Participants suggested additional factors to consider in this trade-off:

- "Cost" should include environmental as well as financial costs.
- Seasonal and annual precipitation variability should be considered.
- There is willingness-to-pay for increased reliability and a known quantity of water for consumptive uses. There will also be a cost/benefit breakpoint.
- Location of storage may influence this trade-off.

The participants chose to combine two of the example trade-offs into one, **Operational Flexibility Vs. Total Cost & Assurances**.

Much of the discussion on this trade-off revolved around phased implementation. CALFED should test different solution sets. Phasing allows the Program to do so and to test the underlying assumptions of each solution set. Assurances could vary with each phase. On the other hand, it may be necessary for the Program to take advantage of windows of opportunity regarding availability of resources such as land or cash. Also, it should be recognized that some needs in the system require immediate attention, while attention to others may be deferred temporarily. It was noted that participant definition of "phasing" may differ from the staff definition of phasing.

Additional points made about this trade-off are that the regulatory environment could change and that funding constraints are likely.

Protecting water supply was a theme of discussion on **Risk to Export Water Supplies Vs. Assurances**. Some strongly desire protection for areas of origin of exported water, such that no more water is exported

than the amount agreed upon. This desire is not reflected in the orientation of this characteristic which is towards the seismic vulnerability of Delta levees. Others desire to protect the amount of supplies coming into their area. Others desire to protect Delta outflow to the Bay. While yet others are interested in water supply for in-Delta uses.

It was noted that assurances to protect in-Delta flows and Delta outflow should differ depending on the size of an isolated conveyance facility. The characteristic pays little attention to Delta outflow relative to water exports.

Public Comment

An individual noted that each BDAC member participated, that the format afforded such participation, and that it was beneficial.

Concern was expressed about having to make decisions on the CALFED program in the light of uncertainty and the lack of broad agreement on the underlying scientific information.

Another concern expressed was that there is a finite amount of water available to allocate to all uses.

BLUE BREAK-OUT GROUP

Eugenia Laychak - Facilitator
Leslie Kendall - Recorder
Dick Daniel - Resource Person

BDAC members present - Byron Buck, Ann Notthoff, Mike Madigan, Marsha Sablan, Roger Thomas, Howard Frick, Robert Meacher

Ms. Laychak opened the session by reviewing the agenda, groundrules, and the expected outcome of the session: To identify and discuss the tradeoffs of most concern.

Discussion began on the trade-off of **Diversion Effects on Fisheries vs. Assurances**. Comments related to tradeoffs, in general were interspersed in the discussion. These comments are listed below:

- Clarification of the process used to compare the alternatives to the distinguishing characteristics and more detailed justification of the rankings is needed to better discuss tradeoffs.
- It may be difficult to compare tradeoffs that rely on objective analysis (i.e. cost) to tradeoffs which rely on qualitative or subjective analysis.
- Assurances for all parts of the Program are needed to meet the objectives and maximize benefits to the entire Program.
- The solution will need to maintain a balance between satisfying the needs of all parties, having necessary funds to pay for the Program, and adequate assurances. This balance needs to be maintained no matter what adjustments are made. The solution should also provide real benefits to all parties.

Comments specific to the tradeoff are provided below:

- Assurances are needed to control operation of facilities.

- The program needs to address assurances for water supply for export and fisheries.
- The Program needs physical limitations on new facilities, as opposed to laws and other "paper" assurances.
- An assurance is needed to sustain a rehabilitated ecosystem.
- A new long term institutional mechanism may be needed to assure proper administration of the Program.
- Assurances are needed to deal with uncertainties and allow assessment of and changes to the institutional mechanism.

The group continued discussion by focussing on the tradeoff of Export Water Quality vs. In-Delta Water Supply Opportunities.

- Concern was expressed about treating issues in terms of "trade-offs".
- Impacts of the alternative solution on all parties is a concern.
- Concern was expressed over the cost of the proposed isolated conveyance and whether there was a more cost effective option for ensuring adequate export water quality.
- An uncertainty is future EPA safe drinking water standards, especially those related to bromide. Costs of future treatment to comply with the standards is a concern for all communities within the CALFED geographic scope. It was suggested that this concern warranted more discussion and possibly development of more options for addressing the bromide issue.
- It was clarified that the term "a need for better San Francisco Bay area water quality" often means support for an isolated conveyance.

The group briefly discussed the tradeoff of Solution Principles vs. Costs.

- Stakeholders should not have to make this tradeoff.
- Costs of the Program may not be excessive then compared to costs of other programs and projects.

The session continued with public comments by two individuals.

Ms. M. Miller of West Sacramento - She will be looking for justification of the conclusions in the draft Program EIR/EIS impact assessments. She is concerned that Yolo county interests may not be adequately addressed in the draft preferred solution and that fisheries concerns may be overstated. She suggested that another tradeoff to consider is water rights vs. water supply opportunities. She also mentioned that enforcement of water quality standards is inconsistent.

Mr. E. Petrie of Mendota - He observed that a politically feasible plan will engender financial support from the public. He stated that if stakeholders have the will, rivers and fisheries can be restored throughout the CALFED geographic area, and that one way to ensure restoration is to build new, affordable facilities.

The session ended with a quick review of the BDAC comments. Several BDAC members asked that breakout sessions be used in the future to focus discussion on important CALFED issues.

GREEN BREAK-OUT GROUP

Mary Selkirk - Facilitator

Sharon Gross - Recorder/ Resource Person

BDAC members present - Roberta Borgonovo, Vice Chair McPeak, Eric Hasseltine, Alex Hildebrand, Hap Dunning, Jack Foley, Tom Graff

- Not enough detail
- Tradeoffs seem to be between assurances + cost
- Characterization of tradeoffs in question
 - *Habitat & flow are more significant than entrainment
- * Alternative.3 - once investment is made it is difficult to turn back.
- * Isolated Conveyance will not address concerns for anadromous fish on San Joaquin; not enough flow to attract fish.
- * Unrealistic expectations for assurances for any Alternative.
- * How to assure that pumpers will get water from Isolated Conveyance.
- * Less dollars invested, more opportunities to be flexible with solution (adaptive management).
- * Characterize assurances as "How to Share the Pain".
- * Water quality more important than increased supply.
- * "Share the Pain"
 - * Need to focus on shared interests:
 - * Institutionally
 - * Supply reliability related to ecological quality.
 - * Common pool concept
 - * Alternatives do not do enough to develop common pool.
 - * Not optimizing Alternative 2 for common pool.
 - * Identify "Bottom Line" to look at tradeoffs.
- * With out common pool concept, water quality in Delta may degrade-common interest is lost.
- * Trade off - export water quality.
- * Expand definition of operational flexibility.
- * How much water will be pumped? Need Delta export limits.
- * No export limits results in a variety of environmental impacts.
- * If export constraints were part of solution, some interests may be more open to options.
- * Export limits will help assure out of low needs.
- * Would export limits change with each Alternative?
- * May depend on the level of environmental benefits you get from the alternative.

Public Comments

- * Not enough time! Too compressed.
- * Discussion of assurances too narrow.
- * Bring adaptive management into assurances discussion
- * BDAC obligation to force process to spend more time.